and Singlachar spoke of the difficulties of the Maidan garden owners.

Reply of Government.—His Highness' Government recognizes the grievance and the question will be taken into consideration at an early opportunity, but no definite promise can now be made as to when and what relief can be given.

Subject No. 181.

Tax on supari to be reduced in cities and done away with in villages.

Mr. Linge Gowda of Nagavagala.

Summary of Representation.—A reduction in the tax on supari from 12 to 8 annas per maund in large cities and its remission in small villages are prayed for.

Mr. C. Vasudeva Rao spoke of lowering of prices, especially of "Gotu".

Reply of Government.—*Vide* Subject No. 180.

Subject No. 182.

Koleroga to areca crop.

Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, Advocate.

Summary of Representation.—1. Owing to the annual attacks of koleroga, arecanut gardens in the Malnad do not yield crops sufficient to cover even their yearly assessment. Amildars may be made to make a special inspection of these gardens to test and note in the Pahani account the number of trees destroyed by the disease and proportionate assessment may be ordered to be remitted.

(2) The Agricultural Chemist, who made his tour of inspection in the summer of last year, may be asked to visit these gardens in the months of August and September when the koleroga generally puts in its appearance.

Reply of Government.—The subject is under investigation by the Agricultural Chemist.

Subject No. 183.

Reduction of demand notice fees.

Mr. Gangaiya.

Summary of Representation.—(1) Four khists are prescribed by Government for payment of the kandayam by a raiyat, but on default of payment of any one of the khists, notice will be issued to the khatedar for the immediate payment of the full amount of that as well as the subsequent khists. As this entails a great suffering to the defaulters, concession must be shown to them by issuing notice only for the amount of the khist under default. Present rates of notice fee are annas four and annas eight. As these are excessive, reasonable reduction must be made in them.

(2) Mr. Sivappa said that notice fee may not be levied unless separate agency is employed for service.

Reply of Government.—Cannot be done. Why should you give room for the issue of such process?

Subject No. 184.

Irregularity in recovering fees on demand notice and sale Istihars.

Mr. Nadiga Sivappa of Sorab.

Summary of Representation.—When temporary processpeons are not employed for serving demand sale notices on Revenue defaulters, the work is delegated to village servants. Notice fees, etc., are collected in some taluks, and no fees are collected in others. A uniform procedure after due enquiry is prayed for.

Mr. Ramanuja Iyengar of Gubbi and others said that when Patels and Shanbhogs serve demand notices, no fees may be levied. Mr. Hutcheeregowda said that such fees were necessary.

Reply of Government.—The rule is that notice fee should be paid as soon as notice issues from the Taluk Cutcherry, and there is no necessity to alter it. Let raiyats pay their instalments in time and escape notice fee thereby.

Subject No. 185.

Sales of personal property for Land Revenue arrears.

Mr. Patel Doddegowda of Krishnarajpet Taluk.
,, Lakshminaranappa of Heggaddevankote.

Summary of Representation.—For arrears of Land Revenue the land upon which the arrears accrue is sold. It sometimes happens that valuable lands are sold for nominal prices and the raiyats are deprived of their lands. It is therefore prayed that the personal property of the defaulter may be proceeded against in the first instance, an exception being made in the case of land owners who reside in other places.

Messrs. Annaiya Pandit, Sivappa, Krishnamurti Rao and many others said that Mr. Lakshminaranappa being a Shanbhog wanted perhaps the alteration to be made. The old rule had been changed on their representation. The present rule was convenient. Proceedings against movables led to oppression. All wanted the existing rule to be maintained.

All the representatives called out by way of acclamation in favour of the existing rule and Lakshminaranappa being persuaded by others to withdraw the subject asked permission to do so.

The Dewan said:—

"We wanted ourselves to consult you on this subject. It now turns out that the opinion is unanimous against movables being sold in the first instance. Think over it again and we will give you all another opportunity of being heard at this meeting."

Note.—No further representation was made.

Subject No. 186.

Authorizing Amildars to restore possession of immovable property if the enjoyment be less than 6 months.

Mr. Nadiga Sivappa.

Summary of Representation.—Pray that Amildars may be empowered to restore possession of immovable property, if the enjoyment of the dispossessed property be for less than 6 months and to dispossess the intruder as per rules in force in the Bombay Presidency.

Messrs. Annaiya Pandit, C. Srinivasa Rao and others were for introduction of the Regulation and empowering Amildars.

Mr. Balakrishna Rao was not for investing Amildars but only Assistant Commissioners.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered in connection with the Draft Regulation now before Government.